

### Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated February 3, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

### Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 17 and 20 have been amended. Claims 2 and 8-13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 22-29 are new. The additional subject matter recited by the claims is supported by at least paragraphs 15-16 of the specification. Hence, no new subject matter has been added to the claims.

### Interview Summary

A telephone interview was conducted on April 13, 2009 between the undersigned and Examiner Dang. During the interview it was discussed that Zirnstein failed to describe generating a query based on search terms received from the e-mail of a wireless device. No agreement was reached.

### 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 8-13, 15, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Zirnstein (US 7,127,491). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to the extent that they apply to the currently pending claims.

### Claims 1, 3, 15 and 22-24

Applicant respectfully submits that Zirnstein fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites “the e-mail server generating a query based on the one or more search terms received in the e-mail from the wireless device; retrieving the information from the private database by executing the query.”

The Office Action contends that Zirnstein describes an e-mail server retrieving information from a private database. Zirnstein concerns a method for providing control of a first computing device from a second computing device via e-mail messages. Zirnstein describes that when an e-mail message is detected by the first computing device with the keyword “CMD:”, a

command that is preceded by the keyword is executed on the first computer device. Once the command is executed, the output of the command is delivered to the second computer via an e-mail message. Zirnstein simply describes that the command contained within a received e-mail is executed on the first computing device. Zirnstein fails to describe generating a command based on the content of the received e-mail. Thus, Zirnstein cannot describe generating a query based on the content of a received e-mail. This is in contrast to claim 1 which recites that the e-mail server generates a query based on the one or more search terms in the e-mail from the wireless device.

Therefore, Zirnstein fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 1 such that claim 1 is allowable over Zirnstein. Claims 3, 15 and 22-24 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Zirnstein for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Claims 17 and 25-26

Applicant respectfully submits that Zirnstein fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 17. For example, claim 17 recites “the e-mail server generating a query based on one or more search terms received in the e-mail from the wireless device.”

The Office Action contends that Zirnstein describes an e-mail server retrieving information from a private database. Zirnstein concerns a method for providing control of a first computing device from a second computing device via e-mail messages. Zirnstein describes that when an e-mail message is detected by the first computing device with the keyword “CMD:”, a command that is preceded by the keyword is executed on the first computer device. Once the command is executed, the output of the command is delivered to the second computer via an e-mail message. Zirnstein simply describes that the command contained within a received e-mail is executed on the first computing device. Zirnstein fails to describe generating a command based on the content of the received e-mail. Thus, Zirnstein cannot describe generating a query based on the content of a received e-mail. This is in contrast to claim 17 which recites that the e-mail server generates a query based on the one or more search terms in the e-mail from the wireless device.

Therefore, Zirnstein fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 17 such that claim 17 is allowable over Zirnstein. Claims 25-26 depend from claim 17 and are allowable over Zirnstein for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

#### Claim 20

Applicant respectfully submits that Zirnstein fails to describe each of the features recited by claim 20. For example, claim 20 recites “generate a query based on search terms from an e-mail received from the wireless device.”

The Office Action contends that Zirnstein describes an e-mail server retrieving information from a private database. Zirnstein concerns a method for providing control of a first computing device from a second computing device via e-mail messages. Zirnstein describes that when an e-mail message is detected by the first computing device with the keyword “CMD:”, a command that is preceded by the keyword is executed on the first computer device. Once the command is executed, the output of the command is delivered to the second computer via an e-mail message. Zirnstein simply describes that the command contained within a received e-mail is executed on the first computing device. Zirnstein fails to describe generating a command based on the content of the received e-mail.

Thus, Zirnstein cannot describe generating a query based on the content of a received e-mail. This is in contrast to claim 20 which recites that the e-mail server generates a query based on the one or more search terms in the e-mail from the wireless device. Therefore, Zirnstein fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 20 such that claim 20 is allowable over Zirnstein.

#### 103 Rejections

Claims 18-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirnstein in view of Matsuo (US 2003/0130857). Matsuo describes an information exchange framework which includes a secure e-mail delivery feature. However, Matsuo fails to account for the above noted deficiencies of Zirnstein in relation to claim 17. Claims 18-19 depend from claim 17 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirnstein in view of Hill (US 6,029,192). Hill describes a method for locating resources on a network using resource evaluations but fails to account for the above noted deficiencies of Zirnstein in relation to claim 17. Claim 21 depends from claim 17 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 17.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1, 3, 15 and 17-29 are in condition for allowance. Applicants request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2009

/Daniel J. Layden/  
Daniel J. Layden  
Reg. No. 60,921

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, GA 30007-1355  
(770) 643-8912